

Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SIEMENS CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 186 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH ISELIN NJ 08830 MAY 3 0 2006
OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of Georg Muenzel

Application No. 09/822,300

Filed: March 23, 2001

Attorney Docket No. 00 P 7515 US 01

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed May 19, 2006, to revive the above identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

This application became abandoned for failure to timely reply to the Final Office Action mailed November 15, 2005. A shortened statutory period of three months was set for replying Final Office Action. A three month extension of time and fee were filed with an amendment in response to the Final Office Action on May 5, 2006.

Comes now, however, petitioner with the instant petition to revive and a Request for Continued Examination (RCE), requesting that the amendment filed May 5, 2006 be

[.] Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

⁽¹⁾ the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

⁽²⁾ the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

⁽³⁾ a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may required additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

⁽⁴⁾ any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

considered the submission required under 37 CFR 1.114.

Furthermore, there is no indication that petitioner herein was ever empowered to prosecute the instant application. If petitioner desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney documentation must be submitted. A courtesy copy of this decision will be mailed to petitioner. However, all future correspondence will be directed to the address of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary.

This matter is being referred to Technology Center 2193 for processing of the RCE and submission.

Telephone inquiries related to this decision should be directed to the undersigned Petitions Attorney at (571) 272-3212.

Patricia Faison-Ball Senior Petitions Attorney Office of Petitions

CC:

MICHAEL N. HAYNES 1341 HUNTERSFIELD CLOSE KESWICK, VA 22947